Remarks:

The following remarks are numbered to correspond with the item numbers the Examiner has used in his Office Action.

4.0: The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5, 18, 20, 22, and 23 under 35USC112 as indefinite based on the claim language "shadow property" contained in each of these claims. Applicant respectfully holds that "shadow property" is not indefinite, and asks the Examiner to reconsider this point. The term is given reasonable clarity and precision in the specification (see, for example, page 30, third sentence of second paragraph; and page 32, middle paragraph).

5.0: The Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, and 15 under 35USC112 as indefinite based on the claim language "influence area" contained in each of these claims. Applicant respectfully holds that "influence area" is not indefinite, and asks the Examiner to reconsider this point. The term is given reasonable clarity and precision in the specification (see, for example, page 24, bottom paragraph).

6.0: Claim 1 is amended by this paper regarding the antecedent of "said components."

7.0: Claim 3 is amended by this paper regarding the antecedent of "said components," and to further clarify the inheritance.

8.0: Claim 6 is amended by this paper regarding the antecedent of "said component."

9.0 and **10.0:** Claim 7 is canceled by this paper. Aspects of the limitations of claim 7 are incorporated into claim 6 by this paper.

11.0: Claim 11 is canceled by this paper. Aspects of the limitations of claim 11 are incorporated into claim 9 by this paper.

12.0: Claim 14 is amended by this paper regarding the antecedent of "said component."

13.0 and **14.0:** Claim 15 is canceled by this paper. Aspects of the limitations of claim 15 are incorporated into claim 14 by this paper.

15.0: Claim 16 is amended by this paper regarding the antecedent of "said component."

16.0: Claims 1 and 9 are amended by this paper to further clarify applicant's invention by adding the phrase "one of the steps of:" in the step of associating as preface to the three acts listed in the step of associating. Claim 21 is canceled by this paper. Claim 23 is amended by this paper to further clarify applicant's invention by adding the phrase "one of the steps of:" in the function for associating as preface to the three acts listed in the function for associating.

17.0: Claim 6 is amended by this paper to further clarify applicant's invention by adding the phrase "one of the steps of:" in the means for associating as preface to the three acts listed in the means for associating.

18.0: Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's interpretation of the term "shadow property," holding that the specification gives the correct interpretation.

19.0: (explanation of 35USC103(a))

20.0: Independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 23, and dependent claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35USC103(a) as unpatentable over Hunter, et al. (6,161,176) in view of Lewis, et al. (5,872,928).

With regard to independent claims 1, 5, 9, 17, 19, 22, and 23: Applicant respectfully holds that Hunter is not material to the patentability of Applicant's invention, in view of Lewis or not. The teachings of Hunter cannot be applied to solve the problems addressed by Applicant's invention, as Hunter concerns "storing settings related to an application in a settings file for transport to a second computer" (abstract), which does not concern the problem solved by the Applicant's invention.

The Examiner cites items 46, 32, 33, 34, and 48 of Hunter's Figure 1, and "asserts that the preamble of Applicant's independent claims in combination with [applicant's] claim language is functionally equivalent to the modeling in software of the functionality and interdependence of a computer system with a plurality of components as disclosed in (Figure 1, specifically, items 46, 32, 33, 34, 48) . . .." Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Because the teachings of Hunter cannot be used to solve the problem addressed by the Applicant's invention, there cannot be functional equivalence between Hunter and the Applicant's invention. The identified items of

Hunter's Figure 1 are, respectively, a serial port interface, a hard disk drive interface, a magnetic disk drive interface, an optical disk interface, and a video adapter, which appear in their ordinary generic roles now common to modern personal computers. In Hunter, none of these items is included within another item in the sense that the term "included" is used in Applicant's specification or claims, and no teaching is cited in Hunter that any of these items is included in another. As a consequence, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a proper prima facie case for rejection by showing teachings in the references that correspond to each and all elements of the Applicant's claims.

The Examiner notes that Hunter teaches the use of a template file and a configuration file. Applicant respectfully holds that these teachings do not concern the Applicant's invention. In Hunter, the template file holds default font styles and margins for word processing documents, and the configuration file holds special toolbar configurations and font substitutions (col. 5, lines 50-56).

Independent claim 13 is canceled by this paper. The limitations of claim 13 are introduced into claim 14; claim 14 is now an independent claim. Applicant's remarks regarding claim 14 appear below, in response to Examiner's item 21.0.

Independent claim 21 is canceled by this paper.

Regarding dependent claim 4: Because claim 4 depends on claim 1, which for the aforementioned reasons Applicant respectfully holds to be allowable, Applicant believes that claim 4 is now also allowable.

Regarding dependent claim 8: Because claim 8 depends on claim 5, which for the aforementioned reasons Applicant respectfully holds to be allowable, Applicant believes that claim 8 is now also allowable.

Regarding dependent claim 12: Because claim 12 depends on claim 9, which for the aforementioned reasons Applicant respectfully holds to be allowable, Applicant believes that claim 12 is now also allowable.

Regarding dependent claim 16: Claim 16 is amended by this paper to depend on claim 14 rather than on claim 13 (claim 13 is canceled). Because claim 16 depends on claim 14, which the Applicant respectfully holds to be allowable for the reasons given below in response to Examiner's item **21.0**, Applicant believes that claim 16 is now also allowable.

Dependent claim 18 is canceled by this paper; claim 17 is amended by this paper to include limitations of claim 18.

Dependent claim 20 is canceled by this paper; claim 19 is amended by this paper to include limitations of claim 20.

21.0: Dependent claims 2, 6, 10, and 14 stand rejected under 35USC103(a).

Regarding dependent claim 2: Because claim 2 depends on claim 1, which for the aforementioned reasons Applicant respectfully holds to be allowable, Applicant believes that claim 2 is now also allowable, as amended by this paper.

Regarding dependent claim 6: Because claim 6 depends on claim 5, which for the aforementioned reasons Applicant respectfully holds to be allowable, Applicant believes that claim 6 is now also allowable, as amended by this paper.

Regarding dependent claim 10: Because claim 10 depends on claim 9, which for the aforementioned reasons Applicant respectfully holds to be allowable, Applicant believes that claim 10 is now also allowable, as amended by this paper.

Regarding claim 14: Claim 13 is canceled, and its limitations are incorporated into claim 14 by this paper. Examiner has rejected claim 13 on Hunter in view of Lewis. For the reasons given above, Applicant believes that a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be based on Hunter. Examiner has rejected claim 14 based on Hunter, in view of Lewis, Bertieg (5,956,031), and Bier (5,581,670), asserting that "An ordinary artisan would have been motivated to search related computer GUI art for methods of inputting data, associating components, and inheriting data in order to obtain the benefit of prior art methods in designing a GUI. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the art of Bertieg et al. and Bier et al with the art of Hunter et al for the benefit of

obtaining the claimed invention." Applicant respectfully notes that Examiner has identified no teachings that these references may be advantageously combined, and further respectfully holds that there is no statutory, regulatory, or judicial basis for a rejection based on an obligation of the Applicant to search the patent literature during the conception or reduction to practice of the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully holds that claim 14, as amended by this paper, is now allowable.

22.0: Dependent claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35USC103(a).

Regarding dependent claim 3: Because claim 3 depends on claim 1, which, for the aforementioned reasons, Applicant respectfully holds to be allowable, Applicant believes that claim 3 is now also allowable, as amended by this paper.

Claim 7 is canceled by this paper.

23.0: Dependent claims 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35USC103(a).

Claim 11 is canceled by this paper. Elements of claim 11 are incorporated into claim 9.

Claim 15 is canceled by this paper. Elements of claim 15 are incorporated into claim 14.

Conclusion: For the reasons given above, Applicant believes that claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22, and 23 as amended here are allowable, and respectfully asks the Examiner to allow these claims. Claims 7, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, and 21 are canceled by this paper. Applicant sincerely thanks Examiner, and requests that the application now pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By: David R. Irvin

David R. Irvin

Reg. No. 42,682